

# EQUALITY OF RIGHTS IN THE TERRITORIES.

## S P E E C H

OF

# HARRISON G. BLAKE, OF OHIO.

Made in the House of Representatives, in Committee of the Whole, June 12, 1860.

Mr. BLAKE said:

*“Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.”*

That sentiment, Mr. Chairman, of ABRAHAM LINCOLN, is worthy the head and heart of the standard-bearer of the Republican party, and should form the text for action of every honest man.

Mr. Chairman, on the 27th day of last March, I had the honor to move in this House a preamble and resolution, which I regarded as simply announcing a self-evident principle, and proposing a very harmless inquiry. But gentlemen on the other side, who are always on the lookout for “incendiary” matter, and whose greatest trouble appears to be that we furnish them so little that they can brand as such, thought they discovered in it what their morbid appetites so much crave, and they seized upon it with an avidity which nothing, save the Helper book, has excited since the commencement of the present session. No time would be allowed for debate, and nothing could be said at the time to explain the objects of the resolution, but the House was driven to an immediate vote. Some Republicans, I infer, apprehended that there might be some latent mischief in it, not discoverable to the naked eye, as they recorded their votes against it. And even some who voted for it are perhaps rather disposed to apologize for the act than to defend it.

The preamble was never voted upon at all, and no member of the House has incurred any responsibility by endorsing it. If it contains anything “treasonable” or “incendiary,” I must bear the odium of it alone, having no one to divide the responsibility with me.

But, sir, after a careful review of both the preamble and the resolution, I can discover nothing in either to retract or apologize for—nothing which I am unwilling to stand up to and defend—nothing but what the honest judgment of every thinking man in the nation will say is clearly right.

I ask, sir, to have the preamble and resolution read:

“Whereas the chattelizing of mankind and the holding of persons as property are contrary to natural justice and the fundamental princi-

ples of our political system, and are notoriously a reproach to our country throughout the civilized world, and a serious hindrance to the progress of republican liberty among the nations of the earth: Therefore,

“Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and the same are hereby, instructed to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill giving freedom to every human being and interdicting slavery, wherever Congress has the constitutional power to legislate on the subject.”

Now, sir, what is the first proposition contained in this “terrible” preamble?

It is, that the holding of persons as property—making slaves of men, women, and children—is contrary to natural justice.

Does any one dispute this? Will any gentleman contend that one man can have a natural right of property in another man?

If so, I am not disposed to argue the question with him; for I am sure that man’s mind must be so entrenched behind a mountain of prejudice, that no argument could ever reach it; and it requires more powers of reasoning than I claim to possess, to make a self-evident proposition more evident. It is true, my colleague [Mr. STANTON] did, a few days since, condescend to argue this question briefly; and if anybody ever succeeded in making a self-evident truth more apparent, he is entitled to that credit. No one, I presume, will venture to dispute the proposition laid down by him, that in the case of two men cast upon an uninhabited island, one could have no right to enslave the other, and make him his property, unless, indeed, one should happen to be a white man and the other a negro. In that case, it may be that some gentlemen would contend, that the white man would have a natural right to enslave the negro. But how much would the right of the white man amount to, if the negro should in a trial of strength prove the stronger of the two, and enslave the white man?

The negro in that case would show that he possessed the natural right to enslave the white man.

But, sir, slavery in this country is not based upon the theory that the white man has a natural right to hold the negro in bondage. If it

were, a man in whom the white blood largely predominated could not be held as a slave.

He would have a natural right to lord it over some darker-skinned brother, instead of being doomed to perpetual servitude himself. But you hold a man in slavery, who is born of a slave mother, without reference to the amount of negro blood in his veins. According to the census of 1850, there were at that time in the slave States 246,635 mulatto slaves. A man having so slight an admixture of negro blood, that you can discover no difference between him and the pure Caucasian, is, to all intents and purposes, a white man; and yet such men are held in slavery. Now, sir, if the relation of master and slave depended upon the natural right of the white man to enslave the negro, what would be the condition of a person seven-eighths white, and only one-eighth black? Could you hold the seven-eighths of white blood in bondage, because one-eighth of negro blood flowed in the same veins?

Would not such a person have just seven times as much right to his freedom as any one could have to hold him in bondage? According to this theory, of a natural right in the white man to hold the negro in slavery, it is clear that a person in whom the blood of the white race predominated could not be held as a slave. And if Southern gentlemen plant themselves upon this theory, and carry it out to its legitimate results, they will find that a process is now going on among them, which will prove vastly more destructive to their interests in slave property, than any underground railroad or John Brown raid.

Perhaps it may be claimed, however, that the slightest admixture of negro blood so taints the whole, as to reduce the unfortunate person in whose veins it flows, to the legal *status* of a full-blooded negro. But this theory will not hold good, because, in some, if not all of the slave States, you permit a man of negro blood, and even a full-blooded negro, if free himself, to hold slaves. In some instances, the master has a much larger proportion of negro blood in his veins, than some of those he holds in slavery. Now, if slavery was based upon the theory of a natural right in the white man to enslave the negro, this could not be. The negro or the mulatto could not hold the quadron in slavery. Carry out the theory, and you would reverse their positions—making the slave the master, and the master the slave.

But I have pursued this argument far enough; and I trust that I have satisfied my Southern friends that their system of slavery is not based upon the theory of a natural right in one man to hold another man as property. If so, I hope they are also satisfied that the first averment in the preamble, which is simply a denial of the existence of any such natural right, is not "incendiary." It is, in fact, what *Thomas Jefferson*, in better language and with greater power, declared, on the 4th of July, 1776: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty,

and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

The next proposition contained in the preamble is, that the holding of persons as property is "contrary to the fundamental principles of our political system." Will any gentleman deny this?

Sir, when our fathers resolved to sever their connection with the mother country, and set up a new political system for themselves and their posterity, they proclaimed to the world, by a solemn Declaration, the cardinal principles which it was their object to establish and maintain. Where, then, shall we look for an authoritative announcement of the fundamental principles upon which our political system is based, if not to that declaration? And if we look to that, what do we find? The very first great principle announced in that instrument is, "that all men are created equal." This great principle they declared to be a "self-evident truth," and for the support of which they pledged "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor." They inscribed them upon the chief corner-stone in the foundation of our political fabric. And now, sir, is not the proposition, that one man has a natural right to hold another man as property, in direct and flagrant conflict with every principle contained in the Declaration of Independence? And when you have succeeded in establishing this doctrine in the administration of the Government, (which I pray God you may never be able to do,) have you not essentially and fundamentally changed the Government which our fathers formed to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity?" You may deny the truth of these principles—you may pronounce them all the vague theories of a wild fanaticism—you may declare that what our fathers regarded as self-evident truths, are in fact self-evident falsehoods—but you cannot deny that they lie at the very foundation of our political system.

Another proposition contained in the preamble, is, that slavery is "a reproach to our country throughout the civilized world, and a serious hindrance to the progress of Republican liberty among the nations of the earth."

Sir, is not this true? What civilized nation on the face of the earth does not reproach us with the great wrong, the gigantic sin, which we are inflicting upon an oppressed and down-trodden people?

What nation does not reproach us with the glaring inconsistency which we present to the world, between the principles we profess and the practice we permit?

Sir, our slaveholding friends may satisfy their own consciences as to the morality and justice of "holding persons as property," but they can never satisfy the consciences of those whose interests are not involved in the question.

The verdict of the Christian world is against

them. The most enlightened nations of the earth do regard negro slavery, as it exists in this country, a great national sin, and therefore "a reproach to any people" who may sanction it.

It will hardly be denied that whatever tends to bring reproach and shame upon us and our institutions, must tend to the "hindrance of the progress of republican liberty among the nations of the earth."

Mr. Chairman, having said all that I deem it necessary to say in defence of the preamble, I now come to the resolution. And what great wrong or outrage does that propose? Why, sir, it simply proposes that a committee of this House, profound in the knowledge of the law, shall inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill "giving freedom to every human being ' and interdicting slavery, wherever Congress ' has the constitutional power to legislate on the ' subject."

There is no room to cavil about the meaning and intent of this resolution. It is, that the Judiciary Committee shall inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill to abolish and prohibit slavery, wherever Congress has the constitutional power to abolish and prohibit it. It does not even indicate where it is supposed that Congress has such power over the subject; but leaves that to the inquiry of the committee, who it is supposed is fully competent to the task.

Sir, I have no desire to withhold my own opinion as to the power of Congress over this subject. I believe the power to exist in Congress to abolish and prohibit slavery in all the territory that belongs to the United States, not included within the limits of some sovereign State. This I understand to be the Republican doctrine. I do not understand that the most conservative Republicans doubt the plenary power of Congress over the subject in all our Territories, and in the District of Columbia as well. But some do doubt the expediency of exercising that power to the full extent that we possess it. Some doubt the expediency of exercising it in this District.

My honorable colleague, the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, has said that he is opposed to abolishing slavery in this District; but I understood him to be opposed to it on the ground of expediency only, and not for any lack of power over the subject. Other Republicans, doubtless, are opposed to interfering with slavery in this District for the same reason.

But, looking at slavery as I do, as a great sin against God, and crime against man, I confess I am in favor of abolishing it wherever the Constitution has given us the power. Regarding human oppression as morally wrong, and "contrary to the fundamental principles of our political system," I will not recognise the expediency of permitting that wrong to exist, where we have the constitutional power to abate it. Sir, in my judgment, it is never expedient to do that which is morally wrong; and to permit a moral wrong to continue, which we have power to abate, appears to me about the same thing as committing that wrong.

Sir, a man need covet no higher compliment than Goldsmith paid to one of England's greatest orators and statesmen, when he pronounced him "*Too fond of the right to pursue the expedient.*"

It may be, that a man may sometimes err, in too rigidly pursuing the right, to the neglect of the expedient; but, if so, I apprehend that it is an error into which politicians of this age and this country are in little danger of falling.

I desire, sir, that the people of the free States shall be entirely free from the sin and the reproach of human slavery. How can this be, so long as the institution is permitted to exist here, or in any Territory of the United States?

Slavery in this District and in the Territories is under the supreme control of Congress; and the people of the United States are responsible for its existence here and there.

The people of the slave States are responsible for slavery in the several States, because it is a matter exclusively under their control, and over which the people of the free States can have no jurisdiction. Sir, I desire whatever there is of sin about slavery shall be exclusively the property of those who desire to maintain it, and extend it all over this continent. My constituents want to bear none of the shame and reproach attached to it, and therefore would abolish it wherever the Constitution has given to Congress the power.

But, sir, in declaring it to be my individual opinion that Congress ought to abolish and prohibit slavery wherever it has the constitutional power to do so, I do not desire to commit any member of the Republican party, unwillingly, to that policy. I am willing that those who think it expedient to refrain from the exercise of this power in certain localities, shall enjoy their own opinions on the subject, and act upon them. In voting for the resolution which I proposed, they would have done no violence to such opinions. For myself, I would only inquire where our constitutional power to abolish slavery extended; and wherever that might be, I would take it for granted that it is expedient to exercise the power. But the resolution was not framed upon this theory. By proposing an inquiry into the expediency of abolishing slavery in places where our power to do so is admitted, it recognised the question of expediency as an open question, fit and proper to be considered, notwithstanding the power might be clear and unquestionable. Now, although I suppose that all Republicans admit the power of Congress to abolish slavery in every portion of our territory not included within the limits of a sovereign State, we do not all agree as to the expediency of exercising that power in certain localities, and especially in the District of Columbia. It is only on the question of expediency, however, that we differ. Why, then, is not this very question of expediency, upon which alone we do differ, a proper subject of inquiry?

Perhaps, if the subject was investigated by the learned committee to which I proposed to send the inquiry, we would all come to think

alike upon it. Perhaps the committee would be able to convince this House and the country, that it may be expedient to sanction and permit the continuance of a wrong, while we have it in our power to suppress it.

Mr. Chairman, I trust I have succeeded in satisfying the most conservative of my Republican friends, that there is nothing in the preamble or the resolution which I had the honor to propose, to startle or alarm the most timid.

I believe I have convinced my Southern friends that they contain nothing more "treasonable" and "incendiary" than the great cardinal doctrines that all Republicans subscribe to, namely, that slavery is morally wrong, and that Congress has full power to prohibit and abolish it in all our national territory.

There are, no doubt, Mr. Chairman, many Southern gentlemen who sincerely believe that there is something very unfair in a doctrine which denies to them the right to take their slaves into the Territories, and hold them there as slaves. I have no doubt they sincerely believe that this doctrine would deprive them of an equality of rights in the Territories with citizens of the free States.

And yet, sir, laying aside all question as to the morality of slavery, I cannot view the subject in that light. The rule is a general one, applicable alike to all the States. If it deprives the citizens of South Carolina of the privilege of holding slaves in the Territories, it denies to the citizens of Ohio the same privilege. The only difference is, that there are more persons in South Carolina than in Ohio who own slaves, and more, probably, who would desire to own them in any Territory to which they might emigrate. If, therefore, the rule would operate unequally on this account, the inequality would result from a difference in the circumstances and in the tastes of the people of the two States, and not from any partiality in the rule itself.

Now, sir, if we may test the fairness of the rule excluding slavery from the Territories by its effects upon the people of the South, resulting from their peculiar circumstances and tastes, may we not, with the same propriety, test the fairness of the opposite rule by its effects upon the people of the North, resulting from *their* peculiar circumstances and tastes? Southern gentlemen complain, that if you exclude slavery from the Territories, you deprive them of the privilege of using, employing, and enjoying, therein, a peculiar kind of property which they have been accustomed to use and enjoy, and which it is agreeable to their tastes and inclinations to use and enjoy, wherever they may go. They say, further, that if slavery is permitted to go into a Territory, that Territory will become a slave State, and thereby the power of the South will be increased in this House and in the electoral colleges. Already, it is said here that *twenty* Representatives on this floor are indebted to slavery for their seats, and more than twenty electoral votes were cast for James Buchanan, at the last Presidential election, based on negro slavery.

If slavery is excluded from the Territories,

it is said you exclude the augmentation of this power, by which slaveholders are permitted to have a representation based on their property in negro slaves.

With at least equal propriety, Northern men may complain, that if you permit slavery in the Territories, you deprive them of using and employing therein the means upon which they have been accustomed to rely for subsistence, and the only means, as a general rule, upon which they can rely, and subject them, besides, to a mode of life and social condition wholly repugnant to their tastes and inclinations. And when the Territories come to form State Governments, they will be slave States, and the slaveholder's property will form the basis of representation here, as well as in the Legislatures of the States. It is said that, in Virginia, the mother of States and statesmen, under this system of slavery, ten thousand white men in Eastern Virginia, simply by reason of their slave property, are enabled to have as great a representation in one branch of the Legislature of that State as forty thousand freemen in Western Virginia. This inequality will exist wherever slavery is permitted to go.

The property which the Northern emigrant has to take with him into the Territories consists of his labor, his skill, his industry, and his ingenuity. Upon the employment of these means he must depend for a subsistence, wherever he goes; and he cannot profitably employ them where negro slavery prevails.

To admit negro slavery into the Territories is to exclude free labor, to a very great extent; and to exclude free labor is to exclude immigration from the Northern and Western States. But the prohibition of slavery does not exclude or diminish immigration from the Southern States. On the contrary, it invites and increases it. It may tend to deter a class of citizens of the South from emigrating to the Territories, but they are not only much the smaller class, in point of numbers, but the class least disposed to emigrate. The most numerous classes of the population of the South (the non-slaveholding classes) are as much interested in excluding slavery from the Territories as the people of the free States. And they are not only by far the most numerous class in the South, but emphatically the emigrating class of that section. Why, sir, there is no class of people in this Union so eager to emigrate as the non-slaveholders of the South. They do emigrate, just as fast as they can command the means of so doing; and when they emigrate, they almost invariably strike for free territory. They have felt the heavy hand of slavery, pressing them to the dust; and whenever they can, they flee from it, as from a pestilence.

Sir, for every slaveholder that would be excluded from the Territories by prohibiting slavery therein, at least twenty free laborers would be excluded by establishing it; and yet we are told that slavery must be permitted to go into all the Territories, to secure equality of rights in them, and to the Southern States.

Sir, what kind of equality is that which incommodes twenty men to accommodate one

man? What kind of equality is that which permits a slaveholder to have a representation in the legislation of the country based on his property in slaves, and at the same time deprives the non-slaveholder of any representation on his property? That is the kind of equality, sir, that the wolf shows to the lamb when he seizes and devours it.

There is something apparently paradoxical in the proposition, that one portion of a community must be permitted to hold another portion in bondage, in order to produce equality of rights and privileges. But when our Southern friends talk of equality of rights, they must be understood as speaking after the manner of a certain august tribunal, and as recognising the doctrine announced by it, that in this country negroes can "have no rights which white men are bound to respect." They must be understood as excluding the negroes altogether from the class of men who have any business to claim rights or privileges. But, even conceding, for the sake of the argument, (which I by no means admit to be true,) the truth of this abominable dogma, it can be shown that scarcely anything could so much tend to inequality of rights in the Territories, to the laboring men of this Republic, as to extend slavery over them.

You may tell me that the non-slaveholders of the South indicate by their votes that they are in favor of taking slavery into the Territories—that they aid in sending men here to advocate and vote for that policy, and to threaten to dissolve the Union if it is thwarted. Why, sir, these people can scarcely be said to have any opinions of their own on political subjects. It is one of the evils that slavery inflicts upon them, that it keeps them in poverty and ignorance, and builds up an aristocracy to think for them and to govern them.

Public opinion on political subjects in the slaveholding States is dictated and controlled by the slaveholding classes. Practically, they are the only classes represented, either in Congress or in their State Legislatures. Although the non-slaveholders of the South may appear to indicate by their votes that they are in favor of extending slavery over the Territories, yet when you bring them to a practical test, you will find that they understand where their interests lie, however inconsistent their votes and their political associations may appear to be with that idea. When they come to emigrate, they will prove to you that they prefer free territory to slave territory. And, sir, in my judgment, if you would give these men the secret ballot, such as the people of the free States have, whereby they could give expression to their honest convictions of duty, slavery would not exist twenty years in any State of this Union.

When these men come to emigrate they exercise their own judgment; while in the matter of voting, as allowed to exercise that right in the slave States, they act upon the opinions of others.

The statistics of emigration in this country will show, that while slavery in the South has

proved a powerful repellant to immigration from the free States, freedom, in the States and Territories where it has been established, has powerfully attracted immigration from the slave States. If we consult the census returns of 1850, we shall find that the number of natives of slave States then living in the free States was nearly three times that of the natives of free States living in the slave States. The same tables will show that Pennsylvania then had nearly twice as many immigrants from slave States as Virginia had immigrants from the free States. Ohio had nearly five times as many natives of slave States within her limits as Kentucky had natives of free States. These returns show, that in 1850, all the slave States that have been added to the Union, since its formation, did not, in the aggregate, contain as many immigrants from the free States as either Ohio, Indiana, or Illinois, did, of immigrants from the slave States. In fact, Indiana alone contained nearly as many immigrants from the slave States as all the slave States together, including the old and the new, did of immigrants from the free States. What a commentary is this, sir, on the institution of slavery!

These statistics show clearly, that while slavery repels immigration from the free States, freedom attracts it from the slave States. All the natural causes and inducements have been in favor of a large emigration from the Northern States to the Southern. The natural tendency of emigration is southward rather than northward; from colder to warmer climates; from densely populated regions, where lands are dear, to more sparsely populated regions, where they are cheap.

In respect to climate, area of territory, and cheapness of lands, the advantages have been greatly in favor of the slaveholding States. Of the original thirteen States, the slaveholding have an area more than one-third larger than the free; and including all the States added to the Union up to the year 1850, the slaveholding have more than double the area of the free States.

The old free States have necessarily thrown off a large emigration, for want of territory to accommodate their rapidly-increasing populations. Naturally, a large proportion of this emigration would have been attracted by the mild climate and the cheap and fertile lands of the sunny South. But the curse of slavery was there, to counteract all the attractions which a bountiful nature had lavished upon the land, and to turn aside the current of emigration which would otherwise have flowed in upon it.

On the other hand, no such necessity for a large emigration from the slaveholding States has ever existed. They have always had abundance of room, and abundance of good and cheap lands within their own limits, to supply all the wants of an increasing population. Yet, in spite of all these inducements to remain, slavery has driven out vast hordes of their people, to seek new homes in more northern latitudes, where, although the summer sun

ter of yourself and others, acting as a committee of the Convention for that purpose.

The declaration of principles and sentiments which accompanies your letter meets my approval, and it shall be my care not to violate or disregard it in any part.

Imploring the assistance of Divine Providence, and with due regard to the views and feelings of all who were represented in the Convention; to the rights of all the States and Territories, and people of the nation; to the inviolability of the Constitution, and the perpetual union, harmony, and prosperity of all, I am most happy to co-operate for the practical success of the principles declared by the Convention.

Your obliged friend and fellow-citizen,  
ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

A similar letter was sent to the nominee for the Vice Presidency, to which the following is the reply:

*Mr. Hamlin's Acceptance.*

WASHINGTON, May 30, 1860.

GENTLEMEN: Your official communication of the 18th instant, informing me that the representatives of the Republican party of the United States, assembled at Chicago on that day, had, by a unanimous vote, selected me as their candidate for the office of Vice President of the United States, has been received, together with the resolutions adopted by the Convention as its declaration of principles.

Those resolutions enunciate clearly and forcibly the principles which unite us, and the objects proposed to be accomplished. They address themselves to all, and there is neither necessity nor propriety in my entering upon a discussion of any of them. They have the approval of my judgment, and in any action of mine will be faithfully and cordially sustained.

I am profoundly grateful to those with whom it is my pride and pleasure politically to co-operate, for the nomination so unexpectedly conferred; and I desire to tender, through you, to the members of the Convention, my sincere thanks for the confidence thus reposed in me. Should the nomination, which I now accept, be ratified by the people, and the duties devolve upon me of presiding over the Senate of the United States, it will be my earnest endeavor faithfully to discharge them, with a just regard for the rights of all.

It is to be observed, in connection with the doings of the Republican Convention, that a paramount object with us is to preserve the normal condition of our territorial domain as homes for free men. The able advocate and defender of Republican principles whom you have nominated for the highest place that can gratify the ambition of man, comes from a State which has been made what it is by special action in that respect of the wise and good men who founded our institutions. The rights of free labor have there been vindicated and maintained. The thrift and enterprise which so distinguish Illinois, one of the most flourishing States of the glorious West, we would see secured to all the Territories of the Union, and

restore peace and harmony to the whole country, by bringing back the Government to what it was under the wise and patriotic men who created it. If the Republicans shall succeed in that object, as they hope to, they will be held in grateful remembrance by the busy and teeming millions of future ages.

I am, very truly, yours,  
H. HAMLIN.

*Hon. George Ashmun, President of the Convention, and others of the Committee.*

Letter from Mr. Lincoln.

The Illinois *Staats Anzeiger* gives publicity to the following letter of Mr. LINCOLN, written about a year ago, upon a question of public policy which was then discussed in several of the States, and which is disapproved in one of the declarations of the Chicago platform:

“SPRINGFIELD, May 17, 1859.

“DEAR SIR: Your letter, in which you inquire, on your own account and in behalf of certain other German citizens, whether I approve or oppose the constitutional provision in relation to naturalized citizens which was lately enacted in Massachusetts, and whether I favor or oppose a fusion of the Republicans with the other Opposition elements in the campaign of 1860, has been received.

“Massachusetts is a sovereign and independent State, and I have no right to advise her in her policy. Yet, if any one is desirous to draw a conclusion as to what I would do from what she has done, I may speak without impropriety. I say, then, that so far as I understand the Massachusetts provision, I am against its adoption, not only in Illinois, but in every other place in which I have the right to oppose it. As I understand the spirit of our institutions, it is designed to promote the elevation of men. I am, therefore, hostile to anything that tends to their debasement. It is well known that I deplore the oppressed condition of the blacks, and it would, therefore, be very inconsistent for me to look with approval upon any measure that infringes upon the inalienable rights of white men, whether or not they are born in another land or speak a different language from our own.

“In respect to a fusion, I am in favor of it whenever it can be effected on Republican principles, but upon *no other condition*. A fusion upon any other platform would be as insane as unprincipled. It would thereby lose the whole North, while the common enemy would still have the support of the entire South. The question in relation to men is different. There are good and patriotic men and able statesmen in the South whom I would willingly support if they would place themselves on Republican ground; but I shall oppose the lowering of the Republican standard even by a *hair's-breadth*.

“I have written in haste, but I believe that I have answered your questions substantially.

“Respectfully, yours,  
“ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

“*Dr. Theodor Canisius.*”